

AMENDMENT TRANSMITTAL LETTER

Docket No. EGYP 3.0-018

Application No.	Filing Date	Examiner	Art Unit
10/052,931-Conf. #1063	January 18, 2002	A. D. Diamond	1753

Applicant(s): Georges Nouadje and Frédéric Robert

Invention: CAPILLARY ELECTROPHORESIS SYSTEMS AND ADDITIVES

TO THE COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

Transmitted herewith is an amendment in the above-identified application.

The fee has been calculated and is transmitted as shown below.

CLAIMS AS AMENDED								
	Claims Remaining After Amendment	Highest Number Previously Paid	Number Extra Claims Present		Rate			
Total Claims	30	- 33 =	0	×	25.00	0.00		
Independent Claims	5	- 5 =	0	х	100.00	0.00		
Multiple Depend	dent Claims (ch	eck if applicab	ie)					
Other fee (pleas	e specify):							
TOTAL ADDIT	0.00							
Large Entity	,			x	Small Enti	ty		
x No additional fee is required for this amendment.								
	ge Deposit Acc			the ar	mount of \$	·		
A check in the amount of \$ to cover the filing fee is enclosed.								
Payment by credit card. Form PTO-2038 is attached.								
The Director is hereby authorized to charge and credit Deposit Account No12-1095 as described below. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.								
x Credit any overpayment.								
x Charge a	any additional fil	ing or application	on processing f	ees req	uired unde	r 37 CFR 1.16 and 1.17.		
Michael H. Tes Attorney/Agent		362			Dated:	October 20, 2006		
LERNER, DAV 600 South Aver Westfield, New (908) 518-6313	nue West Jersey 07090)LZ & MENTL	IK, LLP	•			

I hereby certify that this paper (along with any paper referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as First Class Mail, in an envelope addressed to: MS Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Dated: October 20, 2006

Signature:

(Michael H. Teschner)

OLD 2 4 7006 W

thereby certify the this paper (along with any paper referred to as being attached to enclose the being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as First Class Mail, in an envelope addressed to: MS Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Dated: October 20, 2006 Signature: (Michael H. Teschner)

Docket No.: EGYP 3.0-018

Group Art Unit: 1753

(PATENT)

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of: Nouadje et al.

Application No.: 10/052,931

Filed: January 18, 2002 Examiner: A. D. Diamond

For: CAPILLARY ELECTROPHORESIS

SYSTEMS AND ADDITIVES

AMENDMENT IN RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

MS Amendment Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

This communication is in response to the Office Action mailed September 20, 2006, setting forth a Restriction Requirement in the above-identified application. In the Office Action, the Examiner required restriction to one of the following inventions under 35 U.S.C. §121:

- I. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7-23, 34 and 35, drawn to a capillary electrophoresis process and method of separating protein constituents.
- II. Claims 24, 25 and 27-30, drawn to a solution of a buffer system for capillary electrophoresis.

In response, Applicants hereby elect the invention of Group I, and corresponding to claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7-23, 34 and 35. However, this election is made with traverse, in view

of the following amendment to the claims. Specifically, Applicants have amended the claims to include new claim 36, which corresponds to the election of Group I since new claim 36 is drawn to a capillary electrophoresis process and method of separating protein constituents. This claim is a "linking" claim. In addition, claim 21 has been amended to correct a spacing error, and claim 24 has been amended to eliminate the "in a liquid support" limitation. No new matter has been added by way of these amendments to the claims.

In view of the foregoing amendment, notwithstanding the different classifications of the claims of Group I and II, "inventions" in these groups are now technologically else, through new claim related, if nowhere 36, and the respective searches would appear to be substantially Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that a coextensive. search for one "invention" will necessarily involve a search for the other as well. In accordance with the policies outlined in the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, where possible, a search of all "inventions" should be made together. respectfully submitted that doing so in this instance will not be unduly burdensome. Reconsideration of the requirement and all the claims examination of are therefore respectfully requested and considered to be appropriate in this case.

In the event the request to examine all the claims together is not granted, Applicants reserve the right to file a divisional application corresponding to the non-elected claims.